

Date: Mon, 14 Jun 93 14:44:49 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #189
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 14 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 189

Today's Topics:

 Blind VE's
 Blind VEs
 Ham-Policy Digest V93 #184
 NQOI Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case (4 msgs)
 NQOI PRB-1 Loss (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 11 Jun 93 16:46:33 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-
state.edu!uwm.edu!ogicse!psgrain!m2xenix!clark!pacifier!mikef@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VE's
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun10.121852.119300@locus.com> dana@fafnir.la.locus.com (Dana H.
Myers) writes:

>
>Hey, this topic has strayed from the rules and is now a flame war (a polite
>flame war, but a flame war) over a non-amateur subject. Might I suggest
>that it best be carried out in provate e-mail, or on alt.radio.amateur.flame?
>
Hmmm ... Isn't the term "polite flame war" an oximoron? :-)

In part, you are correct in that we are not going to solve
the problem here. You are also correct in that bandying about
terms such as racism tends to get peoples' backs up. Civil

rights normally has very little to do with amateur radio; I suspect that many Usenet junkies flee here in the hope of finding a bastion of sanity in the Usenet chaos! :-)

In another sense, however, the discussion really is relevant in that it goes to the heart of the question of the extent to which one group in our society -- the blind -- will be allowed to participate in all facets of this wonderful hobby of ours. The pathos of it all is that we, the blind, took for granted that amateur radio was one of those places where performance counted, where we were considered equals and were held to the same standards as the sighted (in terms of outcomes -- not language sophistry). PR90-356 made the first dent in this armor of conviction; now we have concrete evidence that the standard is changing -- for the worse.

Perhaps the debate should end for few minds are apparently being changed (though one would hope that some people are being made to think a bit). However, the controversy will not go away for its implications vastly transcend the hobby of amateur radio and encompass many fields in which the blind successfully work today but from which they were until relatively recently barred and which they entered at great personal cost.

So, Dana, you are right; the issue has gone beyond amateur radio. But it still primarily affects a group of hams -- blind hams -- and therefore merits some discussion.

73!

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221		Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

Date: 13 Jun 93 16:33:06 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!uwm.edu!ogicse!psgrain!m2xenix!clark!pacifier!
mikef@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9306121658.AA02907@ucsd.edu>
William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:
>
>The FCC has decreed "VEs must be able to observe ...". the guys in West

>Virginia didn't want to work with the person this whole debate is about.
>There probably is a lot more to this story but we don't have that.

>

That may be. No one is arguing here that the VE team didn't have the right to refuse to work with the blind WVA ham. My only contention (and, I believe, that of the other blind radio amateurs taking part in this discussion) is that the refusal cannot and should not be on the basis of blindness or the supposed competence or incompetence of the blind as a class. Discrimination on the basis of race or religion is not allowed in the regs; we believe that other statutes preclude discrimination on the basis of blindness and that, if they do not (which I do not concede), they should.

>

>You are now in a hole, administratively speaking, because there has been a
>decision made that is unfavorable to you.

>

Not only blind hams are in a hole; blind persons could be in a world of hurt were this ruling to be cited in hearings involving their competency.

>

>You now have to show to the FCC that all the high and mighty speech about
>blindness not being an impediment to being a VE is not just so much hot air.

>

Wrongo! It is now up to the FCC to cite convincing evidence -- evidence in the form of an overwhelming number of actual incidents -- that the blind are incompetent to be VEs. This evidence must not be based upon notions of what the blind can and cannot do or upon belief but upon actual cases.

>

>Your task is to develop a presentation that could be given to the FCC to show
>their fears about blind individuals being VEs are unfounded. This has to be
>done in a non-adversarial form. It may be reasonable to test this on the WV
>hams that didn't want to work with the individual in question in the first
>place.

>

Guilty until proven innocent. Very American.

Seriously, though, you set us (the blind) a task that no person -- be he/she sighted or blind -- could meet for allaying fears is, to a great extent, a function not of the object of fear but of the person who is afraid. It is unfair to set the blind tasks that are insurmountable for the sighted were they to be religiously enforced as a standard of conduct.

>

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEnie: M.FREEMAN11

Telephone (206)574-8221 | Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

Date: 14 Jun 93 18:45:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #184
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1993 15:22:47 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQOI Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun13.185508.13615@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>
>What is needed to combat this precedence trend is some sort of standard
>process to determine at what height the point of diminishing returns sets
>in, given terrain, soil quality and other factors. This doesn't mean one
>height for us all; rather, it means that hams who need more height can
>get it. The process itself is defensible, and as a standard, once established
>in precedent, would greatly strengthen PRB-1.

>
>The other alternative is to develop antenna systems which don't require
>height for optimal performance. Most of the commercial development in
>antennas has tended towards horizontal beams -- yagi optimization, stacked
>beams, etc. Vertical array development, in contrast, has been the subject
>of considerable research, but little commercial development. For example,
>the work here at Stanford in OTH radar started with large horizontal log
>periodics on high towers, but evolved into phased, ground mounted vertical
>arrays. You can get a suprising amount of gain out of a four element square
>array, with a better TOA than most beams, no moving parts, and much better
>wind survivability. So, alternatives do exist.

That's applicable to HF, but not to UHF where line of sight issues dominate. Fortunately, there are standard formula for calculating UHF and microwave paths. Establishing height requirements on a sound engineering basis should be fairly simple.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary

Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: 14 Jun 1993 19:51:54 GMT
From: nothing.ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1598@arrl.org> jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:
>Great! I think I'll buy the property next to yours to keep my pigs and
>chickens. I like my music at rock-concert volume, too.

Mozart and Haydn at rock-concert volume?
- Brian

Date: 14 Jun 93 14:37:15 EDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!udel!news.intercon.com!psinnntp!arrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster of Peladon)
writes:
>I agree wholeheartedly with this sentiment. As far as I'm concerned if one owns
>the land, one can do what one likes with it. If that happens to include
>eracting a tower (even an extremely high one), then so be it.

Great! I think I'll buy the property next to yours to keep my pigs and
chickens. I like my music at rock-concert volume, too.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: 14 Jun 1993 15:24:33 -0500
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-
mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1598@arrl.org> jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster of Peladon) writes:

>>I agree wholeheartedly with this sentiment. As far as I'm concerned if one owns
>>the land, one can do what one likes with it. If that happens to include
>>eracting a tower (even an extremely high one), then so be it.

>

>Great! I think I'll buy the property next to yours to keep my pigs and
>chickens. I like my music at rock-concert volume, too.

>-----

>Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
>American Radio Relay League |
>225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Jon:

This is the third sarcastic reply that I've gotten to my basic statement. I've explained it further in two different articles, but this seems to do absolutely no good.

So I tell you what. You can move next door to me, sure. Glad to have you. I'll be moving myself and my pet skunks into your home soon after. I'll eat your food, drink your drinks, use your furnishings and make love to your wife. And by the way. I'm sure that you wouldn't mind me helping myself to what's in your wallet as well. And since I don't drive a car I'll be sure to sell yours quickly so that I can afford cab fare. After all. This **is** SOCIETY, and we have to work TOGETHER.

That last paragraph was pretty darned ridiculous, wasn't it? I'd say that it was a pretty good example of the sort of farcical posts that I've been seeing in response to my statement in favor of NQOI and individualism. I won't explain my statement again here, because that's been done in two other articles. I'm not sure what the problem is here, but how about discussing this issue like **adults** for a change?

--

David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will **NEVER** go back!
*** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) ***

Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1993 14:52:31 GMT
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!pineapp@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: NQOI PRB-1 Loss
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I also would have to agree with the courts. It sounds like that this person did not do his homework, but since I was not there at the hearing I only have to speculate.

The city of San Carlos, Ca. has one of the best antenna ordinance that . The city planning commission and the hams had many meetings to come up with a sound and astictic (sp) environment. This had taken over the period of two or more years.

The net results was that a ham can have a tower, including the top of the antenna, no higher than 65 feet. If anything is requested to go over the 65 feet height. They would have to summint in writing to the planning commission and the local ham radio club. With the local ham club working WITH the planning commission. So far no wone has requested the extention, but everyone who has a tower is very please on the environment.

If you want more information on the city plans you can write to Planning commission

San Carlos City Hall
San Carlos, Ca. 94070

--

INTERNET: pineapp@netcom.com	Daniel Curry WB6STW
AMPRNET : dan@wb6stw.ampr.org [44.4.20.144]	E-:-) Ham Radio operator
AX.25 : wb6stw@n0ary.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NA	Redwood City, CA

Date: 14 Jun 93 11:39:56 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!raistlin!timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!
dadams@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQOI PRB-1 Loss
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 29768@ncar.ucar.edu, elmore@rap.ucar.edu (Kim Elmore) writes:

| This implies that NQOI may not be willing to "roll hia own".
| Knowing the guy, I can assure that 'tain't so. Now, note this
| carefully: NQOI was *NEVER! OFFERED* the now-famous "60' Compromise".
| It was *proposed* by the planning board to the Commissioners. They
| declined to offer it to him. IT WAS NEVER LAID ON THE TABLE AS AN
| OPTION BY THE COMMISSIONERS. In fact, the *Commissioners* NEVER
| offered any kind of compromise. All that was ever offered, either
| privately or publicly was 35'. Careful reading will reveal this in
| the judgement.

|

However NQOI could take the court rulling as a dictum, that the commissioners offer such a compromise, or that they allow him to go ahead and erect a 60' crank up tower.

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com
-Sourdough and Ham- NOWWN

- Minnesotans for Global Warming!

Date: 13 Jun 93 06:29:06 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!logicse!psgrain!m2xenix!clark!pacifier!mikef@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun11.153943.3445@ennews.eas.asu.edu>,
<1993Jun11.202613.29623@ennews.eas.asu.edu>,
<1993Jun12.035024.157905@locus.com>2xen
Subject : Re: Blind VE's

In article <1993Jun12.035024.157905@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>In article <1993Jun11.202613.29623@ennews.eas.asu.edu>
shandrow@enuxva.eas.asu.edu (Darrell B Shandrow) writes:

>>Like I said, noone is perfect. I messed up and duped this article. I'm
>>very sorry for that. However, this does not in any way detract from its
>>contents.

>>

>

>After all the zealous banter and strident militancy you've treated us
>to, are you certain sending a duplicate article does not in *some* way
>detract from your points?

>

Whooooooo boy!

I tried desperately to ignore this but find myself unable to do so.

Are you implying by the above that the sighted *never* make a mistake?

The humility of this boggles the mind!

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com

Vancouver, WA 98685 USA | GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221 | Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

Date: Mon, 14 Jun 93 17:42:32 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun11.154230.12536@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1vadaJINNg4e@crcnis1.unl.edu>, <C8KHpI.8Dv@HAN.Paramax.COM>aulf
Subject : Re: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

In article <C8KHpI.8Dv@HAN.Paramax.COM> raichel@HAN.Paramax.COM (Alan J. Raichel)
writes:

> I hope that in the future, these antenna restrictions can be
>reduced. The only hope that I see for reducing these limitations is to
>get more people interested in having antennas. Direct Broadcasting Satellite
>has the potential of doing this. When the average person runs down to
>Kmart, and buys a 2 foot satellite dish, and installs it, and is told
>to take it down, he would be upset. If enough people get upset, there might
>be change from NO antennas, to allowing SMALL antennas, etc. This is a
>far cry from 125' towers, but at least it would be a step in the right
>direction.

We're beginning to see some shards of hope in some of the recent covenant
litigation, based, oddly enough, on PRB-1. There was a ruling recently in
California which rejected one ham's attempt to obtain a variance for an 80'
tower, BUT argued that if enough covenants in a municipality ban antennas
altogether, this may constitute a municipal ban on antennas, which according
to the opinion, is disallowed by PRB-1. Note that this argument was *not*
made by the ham's attorney; it was unsolicited.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: 10 Jun 93 15:23:02 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-
state.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!logicse!psgrain!m2xenix!clark!pacifier!
mikef@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C827zu.3sA@pacifier.rain.com>, <C8BE93.Iq5@amdcl2>,
<1993Jun9.135811.1174@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>-sta

Subject : Re: Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(

In article <1993Jun9.135811.1174@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

>In article <C8BE93.Iq5@amdcl2>, brian@amdcl2.amd.com (Brian McMinn) writes:

>

[...]

>|>

>|> The same is true of the VE program today. There is currently a
>|> question about whether a blind person can "observe" the test session
>|> and detect cheating. We should be able to come up with an appropriate
>|> "skills" test for all prospective VE's. Such a test would require the
>|> ability to detect cheating. The catch 22 here is that this kind of
>|> test can never be objective because it requires another human subject
>|> to play the "cheater" and be caught.

>|>

>|> Anybody want to suggest how such a test would be given? Would such a
>|> test answer the needs of the FCC and of the blind hams? Is it
>|> reasonable to require all VE candidates to demonstrate such skills?

>|>

>

>While I can certainly understand the importance of such a test in the
>case of a life-or-death line of work such as firefighting - such a test
>to challenge the abilities of the handicapped smacks of discrimination. It
>almost seems like people want to find something that they can use to validate
>their discrimination.

>

Yup; that's the way it looks from this vantage point. But
Brian, IMHO, wasn't indulging in this passtime.

>

>I am not saying that Brian is prejudiced against the handicapped, just that
>the able bodied should resist any temptation to create artificial barriers
>for the handicapped. I work with several handicapped people - and the best
>way to act is not to act - simply disregard their disability and conduct
>business as usual. The handicapped know what their limitations are and most
>will speak up if it becomes an issue. Look at the person, not the handicap.

>

Great advice! Too bad this post wasn't reposted 25 times. OTOH
that doesn't guarantee that anyone would read it 25 times!

In Brian's defense, though, his missive was great satire!
I enjoyed the humor. OTOH, even if it *was* serious, it'd
be fun being one of the OVC's (Official Volunteer Cheaters) :-)!
Count me in. {grin}

73!

--

Mike Freeman

|

Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ

301 N.E. 107th Street | Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA | GENie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221 | Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

Date: 10 Jun 93 16:05:56 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!logicse!psgrain!m2xenix!clark!pacifier!
mikef@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun8.165024.22139@ke4zv.uucp>, <C8DDzH.Au6@ucdavis.edu>,
<1993Jun10.002147.25377@en.ecn.purdue.edu>ath.ohio
Subject : Re: blind VEs

In article <1993Jun10.002147.25377@en.ecn.purdue.edu> n9ljx@en.ecn.purdue.edu
(Scott A Stambaugh) writes:

>

>Here is the point that I have a problem with. It is the READER who is making
>the judgements as to what is questionable. The READER is not certified as a
>VE. It is the READER who is doing the OBSERVING, not the VE. Unless the
>reader is able to convey ALL activity in the room to the VE, the VE will not
>be able to OBSERVE the activities and take appropriate action on the
>activities that the VE deems in appropriate.

>

The blind VE can tell the reader the sort of things he/she deems
inappropriate. If an activity could be deemed inappropriate
or if the reader felt there might be a question, he/she could
exercise 'all-purpose Plan Z: ask the blind VE!

Ciao!

--

Mike Freeman | Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street | Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA | GENie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221 | Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

Date: 10 Jun 93 16:15:34 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!uwm.edu!logicse!psgrain!m2xenix!clark!pacifier!
mikef@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1u14a0INN492@topaz.bds.com>, <C83rM3.G8s@pacifier.rain.com>,
<1993Jun10.025221.499@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>cse

Subject : Re: Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(

In article <1993Jun10.025221.499@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>In article <C83rM3.G8s@pacifier.rain.com> mikef@pacifier.rain.com (Mike Freeman) writes:

>>In article <1ul4a0INN492@topaz.bds.com> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

>>>In at least the case of the ARRL/VEC, the three required amateurs are not

>>>just their as body count to bless the proceedings, they are each individually

>>>required to grade each exam, inspect the ID's, and review and sign the 610.

>>>There's not any authority vested in the examiners to do otherwise.

>>>

>>That is as it should be. All we blind amateurs are asking is that we

>>be given the credit, respect and responsibility for using our

>>own techniques for performing these tasks.

>

>If it can be done WITHOUT the need for another individual and without

>requiring the test taker to make an accommodation to the blind VE, then

>I'd say fine. I still can't fathom how someone who is totally

>blind can accomplish that, BUT I'm certainly willing to learn if

>there's a way to do it.

>

>

If we go down that road then judges must research their own decisions (no clerks); they must type them up themselves (no secretaries) and, in fact, there should be no court reporters for they might alter the transcripts.

Far-fetched? Perhaps. But it is no more so than presuming that a blind VE would, ipso facto, not be in charge and carry out his/her duties (with or without accommodations).

But I shall not argue this point further as it would appear to be a stumbling block over which some would appear incapable or unwilling to cross.

The fact remains that the implications in legal precedent of this ruling are horrendous and that the blind, IMHO, have little choice but to fight it. IMHO there would have been better arenas for the battle but we no longer have a choice of theater.

73!

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221		Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

Date: 14 Jun 93 10:29:02 EDT
From: world!ksr!jfw%ksr.com@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun11.154230.12536@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1vadaJINNg4e@crcnis1.unl.edu>, <C8KHpI.8Dv@HAN.Paramax.COM>
Subject : Re: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

raichel@HAN.Paramax.COM (Alan J. Raichel) writes:

> I hope that in the future, these antenna restrictions can be
>reduced. The only hope that I see for reducing these limitations is to
>get more people interested in having antennas. Direct Broadcasting Satellite
>has the potential of doing this. When the average person runs down to
>Kmart, and buys a 2 foot satellite dish, and installs it, and is told
>to take it down, he would be upset.

Perhaps the thing to do is to find out which large companies are hoping to
make piles of money in DBS services, and make sure they know they have to
clear out all these CC&Rs first to be able to have customers. If the cellphone
industry can buy new laws from Congress, why not the DBS industry?
(Sadly, there is no need for a smiley here.)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #189
